

Memorandum to: Dr. Hobbis

From: D.A.Gray

17th November 1966

Comments on RDH/MC/34

Leo,

Jeff and Norman have looked at the Division Heads Committee paper on security and independently have made the comments attached. Probably the most important criticism and with this I agree, is that there is insufficient information in the paper to enable the D.H.C. to make any sensible decision. No estimate has been given of the value of goods lost by theft. Has any realistic estimate been made? If not, then a realistic estimate should be made before starting on any major scheme for preventing loss by theft. Independently, the Laboratory should decide what is the reasonable loss which one has to accept as a fact of present day life. This figure could be arrived at by consulting other people who are in a similar position e.g. A.E.R.E., Culham, an electrical or electronic manufacturing firm and a University. (Security Officers must always say that security is not good enough!) If the estimated cost of thefts is larger than the 'accepted' loss, more security precautions must then be considered.

If the above suggestions were accepted at the D.H.C. then there would be no point in arguing about scheme (A) or (B) now. However.....

The decision about what type of extra precautions should be taken must depend on costs and other things. For instance :

- (1) What is the cost of Scheme A including fence and car parks and extra patrolmen?
- (2) Where is the complement for the extra patrolmen to come from?
- (3) If scheme (B) is to be used, how many patrolmen and women (?) are required and how much do they cost?

Jeff and Norman are in agreement with the points above.

If the difference between estimated losses and 'accepted' losses is larger than the cost of any reasonable increase in security and if we have to argue about (A) or (B) then.....

I agree with Jeff that scheme (B) is to be preferred. We think that the 'bogy' of right of search is overemphasised. For instance, it is used at Culham. A large proportion of losses could well be in the form of small items which are carried on the person and unless wide powers of search are used in scheme (A) this type of theft will not be deterred. If one is going to search

people, searching of cars is only a minor increase in the amount of work and scheme (A) reduces to scheme (B). The inconvenience of having to keep all private cars outside the fence is not then a problem.

Norman does not agree and is worried by the exercising of the right of search, feeling that there will be lots of unpleasantness. He is also worried about the legal aspects and also raises the problem of private property brought in for repairs. Lots of private property is required in the Laboratory - do we want to stop it? How would one deal with these cases at the search?

Our recommendations are:

(1) That the D.H.C. should agree that a realistic estimate should be made of the value of goods lost from the Laboratory by theft.

(2) That the D.H.C. should agree that a realistic figure should be determined for 'acceptable' losses.

(3) If (1) is greater than (2), that extra precautions should be considered together with estimates of the cost of these.

D.A.G.